

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Examiner States: “**Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 8 refers to claim 8, which is confusing.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Examiner States: “**Claims 1 and 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Meltzer et al. (US 6,366,925).**

Meltzer et al. (hereinafter Meltzer) teaches a method and system for conducting legal services, comprising:

Claims 1 and 9. Electronically accessing immigration/naturalization application center over a computer network (C. 5, L. 30-40); entering preliminary screening and qualifying data via a graphical user interface (C. 6, L. 24-37); electronically determining eligibility of the user for various INS procedures related to immigration and naturalization based on preliminary screening and qualifying data (C. 8, L. 48-53); automatically matching the responses to a questionnaire and applicable questions on the INS forms identified (C. 12, L. 38-40, 59-64); and electronically sending the completed forms to the particular agency (C. 12, L. 39-55).

Claim 3. Making electronic payments for required fees (C. 14, L. 8-9).

Claims 4-5. Accessing the website over the Internet (C. 4, L. 62 — C. 5, L. 2; L. 39-40).

Claim 6. Electronically providing instructions to be undertaken by the client (C. 7, L. 15).

Claim 7. Determining eligibility of the user by comparing qualifying data to INS requirements (C. 8, L. 34-36).

Claim 8. Creating an account (log) containing qualifying data particular to the user (C. 9, L. 39-60).”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Examiner States: “**Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer.**

Claim 2. Meltzer teaches all the limitations of claim 2, expect specifically teaching *printing* the completed forms.

Official notice is taken that printing from the Internet is well known.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Meltzer to include printing the completed forms from the website, because it would advantageously provide user with a hard copy of the filled forms if the electronic system fails.”

Response to Arguments

4. Examiner States: “Applicant’s arguments filed 9/30 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant argument that the prior art does not teach *an automated Interactive system which allows a user to access a government application and servicing center on-line, wherein once a user enters preliminary screening and qualifying data, the system electronically determines the eligibility of the user and automatically selects the various government forms which will be required to be filled out*, it is noted that Meltzer teaches a method and system for electronically accessing immigration/naturalization application center over a computer network (C. 5, L. 30-40); entering preliminary screening and qualifying data via a graphical user interface (C. 6, L. 24-37); electronically determining eligibility of the user for various INS procedures

related to immigration and naturalization based on preliminary screening and qualifying data (C. 8, L. 48-53); automatically matching the responses to a questionnaire and applicable questions on the INS forms identified (C. 12, L. 38-40, 59-64); and electronically sending the completed forms to the particular agency (C. 12, L. 39-55).”

Conclusion

The Examiner states: “Applicant’s amendment necessitated the new group(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS FINAL.**”

///